

09/847,147

00RE196

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 18-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 14-17 have been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement. Applicants' representative notes with appreciation the indication that claims 8-12 and 9-22 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 9, 18, 20 and 22 have been amended herein. Claims 13, 19, and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, while claims 23-29 have been newly added. Furthermore, no new matter has been added that would necessitate further search by the Examiner. A claim list in revised amendment format can be found at pages 2-6.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 13 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 7, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hancock (U.S. 2,520,204). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the integral field cup and front end shield being coupled on a second side to an *armature plate* coupled to a *friction disk* coupled to the motor shaft wherein the armature plate is operable to actuate axially toward the friction disk and a *stationary plate* and a *fan* located *outside the brake portion*. Such elements are not disclosed by Hancock. Furthermore, Hancock alone or in combination with Nashiki and Rossi fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations. Accordingly, claim 1 (as well as claims 2-8 and 29 depending directly or indirectly therefrom) is allowable and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim 24 has been added to more particularly and distinctly describe the invention

09/847,147

00RE196

so as to patentably distinguish the subject invention over the prior art. Moreover, claim 24 incorporates allowable subject matter from claim 8. Thus, claim 24 (as well as claims 9-12, and new claims 25-28 depending directly or indirectly thereon) is allowable and withdrawal of its rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 13 is now moot in view of its cancellation.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 19 (canceled herein). Accordingly claim 18 (as well as claim 20 depending thereon) is allowable and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, independent claim 23 has been newly added herein and contains the allowable subject matter of claim 21. Thus, allowance of new claim 23 (and claim 22 depending thereon) is respectfully requested.

## **II. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock (U.S. 2,520,204) in view of Nashiki (U.S. 5,039,900). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to be patentable in the manner discussed *supra*. Claim 4, by virtue of its dependency, contains all the limitations of claim 1. Hence, claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

## **III. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock (U.S. 2,520,204) in view of Rossi (U.S. 4,811,820). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to be patentable in the manner discussed *supra*. Claims 5 and 6, by virtue of their dependency, contain all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claims 5 and 6 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

09/847,147

00RE196

**IV. Conclusion**


The present application is believed to be condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone: (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731